DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 979 EA 025 522

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Students At Risk. Legislative Research Commission Report to the 1993 General Assembly of North Carolina. |
| INSTITUTION | North Carolina Legislative Research Commission, Raleigh. |
| PUB DATE | 93 |
| NOTE | 52p. |
| PUB TYPE | Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC03 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *At Risk Persons; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; Family Environment; *Family School Relationship; *High Risk Students; Holistic Approach; Resources; Secondary School Students; *Social Services; *State Action; State Programs |
| IDENTIFIERS | *North Carolina |

ABSTRACT

This document summarizes the proceedings of meetings held by the North Carolina Legislative Research Commission's Committee on Students at Risk in autumn 1992. Presenters were representatives of North Carolina governmental agencies and other organizations or programs. Findings include the following: (1) The term "students at risk" places responsibility on the student and overlooks the underlying conditions; (2) first priority should be placed on early intervention; (3) many of the state's programs and services are fragmented; (4) the state should develop a comprehensive child-focused, family-based approach; and (5) the state should use the Kentucky Family Resource and Youth Services Centers Program as a model of a school-linked family resources program. The committee endorses two legislative proposals before the North Carolina General Assembly that would establish a grant program to strengthen family resources and an independent study commission to improve educational support services. The committee also recommends that the Department of Public Instruction undertake a comprehensive study of various issues and that the Teacher Training Task Force study methods to increase the recruitment of minorities into the teaching profession. Appendices contain legislative memos, a list of committee members, and the two legislative proposals. (LMI)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

EA

# LEGISLATIVE

# RESEARCH COMMISSION

ED 364 979

---

# STUDENTS AT RISK

## REPORT TO THE 1993 GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. L. Martin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

EA 025 522

A LIMITED NUMBER OF COPIES OF THIS REPORT IS AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION THROUGH THE LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY.

ROOMS 2126, 2226
STATE LEGISLATIVE BUILDING
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27611
TELEPHONE: (919) 733-7778

OR

ROOM 500
LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27603-5925
TELEPHONE: (919) 733-9390

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of Transmittal..... i

Legislative Research Commission Membership.....ii

PREFACE..... 1

COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS..... 3

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 17

APPENDICES

Memorandum from chairs of Legislative Research Commission authorizing the study..... A

Membership of the LRC Committee on Students at Risk..... B

Legislative Proposal I -- A BILL TO BE ENTITLED AN ACT TO ESTABLISH A GRANT PROGRAM TO STRENGTHEN FAMILY RESOURCES AND APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR ITS IMPLEMENTATION and a Summary of the Bill..... C

Legislative Proposal II -- A JOINT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH THE COMMISSION TO IMPROVE EDUCATION SUPPORT SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND FAMILIES ..... D

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COMMISSION

STATE LEGISLATIVE BUILDING

RALEIGH 27611

January 15, 1993

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE 1993 GENERAL ASSEMBLY:

The Legislative Research Commission herewith submits to you for your consideration its final report on Students at Risk. The report was prepared by the Legislative Research Commission's Committee on Students at Risk at our direction pursuant to G.S. 120-30.17(1).

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel T. Blue, Jr.
Speaker of the House

Henson P. Barnes
President Pro Tempore

Cochairmen
Legislative Research Commission

1991-1992

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COMMISSION

MEMBERSHIP

President Pro Tempore of
the Senate
Henson P. Barnes, Cochair

Senator Frank W. Ballance, Jr.
Senator Howard F. Bryan
Senator J. K. Sherron, Jr.
Senator Lura Tally
Senator Russell G. Walker

Speaker of the House of
Representatives
Daniel T. Blue, Jr., Cochair

Rep. Marie W. Colton
Rep. W. Pete Cunningham
Rep. E. David Redwine
Rep. Frank E. Rhodes
Rep. Peggy M. Stamey

## PREFACE

The Legislative Research Commission, established by Article 6B of Chapter 120 of the General Statutes, is a general purpose study group. The Commission is cochaired by the Speaker of the House and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and has five additional members appointed from each house of the General Assembly. Among the Commission's duties is that of making or causing to be made, upon the direction of the General Assembly, "such studies of and investigations into governmental agencies and institutions and matters of public policy as will aid the General Assembly in performing its duties in the most efficient and effective manner" (G.S. 120-30.17(1)).

At the direction of the 1991 General Assembly and the cochairs of the Legislative Research Commission, the Commission has undertaken studies of numerous subjects. These studies were grouped into broad categories and each member of the Commission was given responsibility for one category of study. The Cochairs of the Legislative Research Commission, under the authority of G.S. 120-30.10(b) and (c), appointed committees consisting of members of the General Assembly and the public to conduct the studies. Cochairs, one from each house of the General Assembly, were designated for each committee.

The study of Students at Risk was authorized by the chairs of the Legislative Research Commission pursuant to G.S. 120-30.17(1). The memorandum from the chairs of the Legislative Research Commission is included in Appendix A. The Legislative Research Commission grouped this study in its Law Enforcement area under the direction of Representative E. David Redwine. The Committee was chaired by Senator William N. Martin and Representative Aaron E. Fussell. The full membership of the Committee is listed in Appendix B of this report. A committee notebook

containing the committee minutes and all information presented to the committee is filed in the Legislative Library.

## COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

The Committee on Students at Risk ("Committee") held four meetings, two of which were two-day meetings. Among those making presentations before the Committee were representatives of the following North Carolina governmental agencies -- the Department of Public Instruction ("DPI"), the Department of Human Resources ("DHR"), the Department of Environment, Health and Natural Resources ("DEHNR"), the Department of Community Colleges, and the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; representatives of the following organizations or programs -- MDC Inc., the Southern Regional Education Board ("SREB"), the Center for Desegregation, Wake County Family and Children Services, Cities in Schools in North Carolina, the Southeast Council on Crime and Delinquency, Project UPLIFT, the Kentucky Family Resource and Youth Services Centers, and the Center for Law and Education; and an education consultant - Dr. Robert Bridges.

### First Committee Meeting -- October 22, 1992

Carol A. Lincoln, a senior research associate with MDC Inc. (a Chapel Hill 'think tank' that studies work-force and community economic development issues) opened the Committee's first meeting with a discussion of two national studies conducted in the eighties that addressed students at risk. The first study, in 1983, resulted from "A Nation at Risk" and focused on schools or systems at risk, rather than on children at risk. Consequently, its recommendations stressed intervention and addressed issues such as dropouts and teen mothers.

In 1988, MDC Inc. conducted a second study that resulted in a report, "America's Shame, America's Hope: Twelve Million Youth At Risk," which Ms. Lincoln distributed to the committee members. This second study evaluated how at-risk youth

fared in the education reform movement that began in the early eighties. Ms. Lincoln noted that the study identified at-risk youth as those youth who "are at risk of emerging from school unprepared for further education or the kind of work there is to do." This definition stimulated the first of several lively discussions among the members as to what each of them perceive the definition of at-risk students to be. The report contains a number of findings, including the following:

> "[T]he most formidable barriers to assisting at-risk youth do not concern lack of money but failure to perceive them as in need of specific long-term attention, resistance to institutional change at the state and local levels, and an absence of genuine leadership at the federal level."

It also sets out continuum of policy and program development phases and lists a number of recommendations.

Second on the agenda were Dr. Henry Johnson and Ms. Johnnie McLaughlin, from DPI. In the 1985-86 biennium, the General Assembly appropriated $15,000,324 for dropout prevention and students at risk. By the 1991-92 biennium, this appropriation grew to $29,308,366. The majority of this money is spent on intervention in the high schools. Almost half of the money is used for in-school suspension. DPI's definition of at-risk youth is broad and inclusive, which results in a wide range of the population being at risk. The dropout problem is shared by race and gender, but the most common thread is poverty. The next most common factors are parental level of education and the level of parental involvement. In addition, students who have been retained once are 50% more likely to dropout than those who have not been retained; students who have been retained more than one time are 80-85% more likely to drop out. North Carolina's dropout rate is in the top part of the bottom one-third of the states. In 1985, the State's dropout rate was estimated at approximately 8%; in 1990-91, the rate was estimated at 5.7%. The first reliable state by state comparison of dropout rates will be out in early 1993.

The afternoon portion of the meeting consisted of presentations by representatives from DHR and DEHNR. They administer or are involved in a wide variety of State-administered programs that affect at-risk children.

The presentations by DPI, DHR, and DEHNR resulted in the following observations:

1. There is little coordination of resources or information among agencies.
2. Most of the programs were established in direct response to categorical funding, such as the community services block grant, aid to families with dependent children, pregnant teens, substance abuse, and Medicaid.
3. Most of the "older" programs focus on intervention; the newer programs are focusing on prevention.
4. Some programs, such as Head Start, only reach a small percentage of eligible children.
5. Some of the newer programs, such as the preschool handicapped programs, are taking a multi-disciplinary, inter-agency approach.
6. There are very few, if any, longitudinal studies that have measured the outcomes or successes of the programs.

**Second Committee Meeting -- November 18 & 19, 1992**

On the first day of the Committee's second meeting, David R. Denton, Director - Health & Human Services Programs for SREB, a policy advisory organization, presented the findings and recommendations from a report: Readiness for School: The Early Childhood Challenge. This report was prepared by SREB's Health and Human Services Commission, which consisted of representatives from the states in the Southern Region, including North Carolina. The report is based on the premise that readiness for school begins at the prenatal level and involves health, education, and socio-economic issues. Consequently, childhood poverty, inadequate day care, and early childhood education must be addressed. In addition, Mr. Denton argued that all children are "at risk" to some extent, but that the term itself is exclusionary because it identifies children, and some will not fit the definition.

According to Mr. Denton, the Commission found that the guiding principles to improve early childhood services should be based on the following "overriding objective:"

> All public policies and programs for families and children ... should be designed to assure every child the opportunity to be born healthy, to have access to necessary preventive and primary health services, to be cared for by nurturing, emotionally healthy adults, and to be nurtured in developmentally appropriate environments that promote maximum cognitive, emotional, social, and physical development.

The report listed the following principles upon which to base efforts to attain this goal: (1) focus on the family; (2) comprehensive and flexible services; (3) developmentally appropriate assessments; (4) schools must be ready for all children; (5) services should be provided by qualified personnel; and (6) accountability for outcomes.

The Commission made nine global recommendations for state action to achieve the goal that all children should be ready for first grade:

(1) Every state should have a mission statement or vision or strategic plan, such as in Florida, Texas, and West Virginia.
(2) Adequate prenatal care programs, such as South Carolina's High Risk Pregnancy Program and North Carolina's Baby Love Program.
(3) Appropriate primary and preventive health care from birth to first grade, such as in Florida, Oklahoma, Virginia, and Tennessee.
(4) Continuous, quality nurturing relationship with one adult, such as via Kentucky's Family Resource Centers and Tennessee's Children's Plan.
(5) Quality child care that involve parents.
(6) Effective transition programs into public schools.
(7) Make comprehensive health education an integral part of the public school curriculum, from preschool through 12th grade, such as in Florida, Kentucky, Alabama, and Arkansas.
(8) Identify barriers to coordination and comprehensiveness of services for children and families, and take aggressive action to break them down.
(9) Identify common regional issues and work together to advocate changes.

Mr. Denton concluded by stating the first things he would do are (1) make quality health care available, and (2) get school systems to think in terms of developmentally appropriate education and get the schools ready for children.

Ms. Thelma Harms, Director of Curriculum Development at the Frank Porter Graham Center, UNC at Chapel Hill, who was one of the members of the SREB Commission, was next on the agenda. She emphasized studies that have found that the staff/child ratios in North Carolina's day cares are among the lowest in the U.S. She stated that they were not even "minimally adequate." According to Ms. Harms, most regulations focus on records, space, and staff/child ratios, none of which guarantee quality. Other states do a better job by setting higher quality ratings and including training and career ladders for staff. She noted that one of the predictors of quality care is higher wages. Ms. Harms also stated that only 20% of kindergartens in North Carolina are developmentally appropriate, and 20% are close. She argued that retention figures in kindergarten are too high, which is NOT due to the appropriateness of the curriculum.

The next presenter was Ms. Nancy Peck, a consultant with the National Center for Desegregation in Florida, who is working with Wake County's dropout prevention program. She stated that schools are based on a false premise -- a timeline. She noted that schools are producing too many students who are disconnected, which begins with a cycle of failure that continues. She would focus on preschool programs in poor areas and provide intensive support to students with an appropriate student/counselor ratio and home intervention.

After a brief lunch break, Ms. Linda Johnson, Program Manager for Family and Children Services in Wake County, explained a new program in Wake County, based on models in Hawaii and Iowa, called Families and Communities Together. This program, which targets the geographic area around two Wake County schools, starts with families when the new mother is in the hospital. A checklist is prepared (based on validated predictors of child abuse), and if the family is identified as at risk and it agrees to participate, home visits are made until the baby reaches the age of five.

During these visits, parents learn about child development. In Hawaii, 95% of the identified families are participating voluntarily. This program has resulted in a dramatic decrease of child abuse and neglect in Hawaii.

Ms. Linda Hyler, State Director for Cities in Schools in North Carolina, was introduced next to explain the Cities in Schools ("CIS") program. It is the oldest dropout prevention program in the country, beginning 20 years ago in Harlem, and gradually spreading to other states. The program provides technical assistance to communities that want to do something. The community establishes a board of directors, of which CIS recommends that 60% come from the private sector and 40% from public agencies. A community first must identify its needs and ALL the resources in the community. Then schools or parts of communities must be identified that have the greatest need. Cities in Schools is based on the premise that the best site is in the schools. Currently, CIS is in 13 communities in NC, and 34 are in process. NC is the first state to expand the program to rural areas. Different communities use different models. For example, High Point CIS guarantees participating students who graduate from high school a job or a scholarship to a community college or college. Ms. Hyler mentioned two barriers to success: (1) the difficulty in obtaining funding from corporate sponsors in small, rural areas; and (2) resistance to change. She stated it is imperative to get people to think differently about the use of money, resources, and people. The strengths of CIS programs, according to Ms. Hyler, are the collaboration of people from different sources, the buy-in at the community level, and the sense of support children and their families perceive.

Next, Mr. Frank Cuthbertson, with the Southeast Council on Crime and Delinquency, was introduced to give the Committee an overview of his tutorial program, which is funded through United Way, city and county funds, and a grant from the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, and which is located in a Greensboro housing

project. The school bus brings the children to the housing project after school so they can receive individualized tutoring. Also, parents must attend programs. Mr. Cuthbertson believes the programs need to go where the children are, and that the entire community needs to be involved in order to achieve success.

On the second day of this two-day meeting, the Honorable Robin Britt, President - UPLIFT, Inc., began with the following facts concerning poverty:

(1) The face of poverty is now a child and a single parent (female).
(2) We have the highest rate of child poverty in 15 years.
(3) 18% of NC is in poverty.
(4) If a child comes from a poverty background, he or she is three times more likely to drop out.
(5) 80% of NC's prison inmates grew up in poverty.
(6) In Greensboro, 39% of the five-year olds are enrolled in the free or reduced lunch program; in High Point, 42% are.

He believes there must be assessment at an early age and early intervention programs. Resources must match families' needs and strengths, and programs must enable parents to take responsibility for their actions. He recommended linking services, thinking collaboratively, giving flexibility to local communities, involving parents, identifying regulatory and statutory barriers, providing leadership, and requiring accountability.

Dr. Robert Bridges, Education Consultant, spoke next about issues affecting the black male student, who has been "on the edge" for the past ten years. This student has been struggling to grow up straight, and is losing. He provided figures based on a longitudinal study involving 5,000 children from 1981-85. In a comparison with white students and black female students, the black male students were consistently at the bottom on the CAT tests — even though there was an improvement in the scores over that period of time. He suggested the following components for a successful program:

(1) target poor minority children who lack support and who have no vision;
(2) change (i.e., improve) the education system and build cultural awareness in teachers;
(3) incorporate a touchable, enthusiastic male role model, preferably black; and
(4) build new strategies under today's conditions.

Dr. Bridges also recommended that the Committee rename itself "Commission on Institutional Failures in Youth Development" because the problem is greater than the public schools and the current title labels children.

An overview of the Kentucky Family Resource and Youth Services Centers was presented by Ms. Ronnie Dunn, Manager - Family Resource/Youth Services Centers, and Ms. Stephany Hoover, Coordinator - Byck Family Resource Center. Kentucky's program is based on the view that the child and family have needs that are barriers to learning. The family resource centers focus on prevention, birth through age 12; the youth services centers focus on the 13-year old and older, concentrating on intervention and preparation for post-secondary life. The program is governed by an interagency task force and is administered by Kentucky's Department of Human Resources, but the centers are located at the schools. It is the result of legislation that established a five-year timeline for implementation of centers in every school with a population of at least 20% free lunch. Maximum grants per school are $90,000, and currently 220 centers have received grants. The money from the grants goes towards salaries, transportation, and administrative costs. Typically, the money pays the salary of the center's director, who is an employee of the local school system. Each center is different because each is designed to meet different needs and resources. In considering whether to implement a similar program in North Carolina, the presenters made the following recommendations: (1) designed at the local level; (2) early identification; (3) allow flexibility as new needs are identified; (4) local ownership - each center is run by an advisory council consisting of 1/3 parents, and 2/3 school and community; (5) emphasize collaboration; (6) think creatively; (7) set criteria, determine how many schools meet the criteria, and set funding appropriately; (8) support must come from the top at State and local levels; and (9) personnel should come from diverse backgrounds.

## Third Committee Meeting -- December 9 & 11, 1992

Dr. Gene Bottoms, Director - SREB State Vocational Education Consortium, opened the first day of the third meeting with a presentation of a project that involves 47 high school vocational education programs in five southeastern states. The schools agreed on a common goal - to raise basic competencies in science, math, and communication so that at the end of five years, the achievement gap between vocational education students and college bound students would close by one-third. In order to reach this goal, the schools agreed on the following steps:

1. Establish high expectations of ALL students.
2. Revise vocational education programs to reinforce higher order competencies.
3. Eliminate remedial, basic, and general courses.
4. Require vocational education students to complete three courses each in math and science.
5. Encourage vocational and academic teachers to work together in preparing students.
6. Actively engage students in the learning process.
7. Provide guidance and counseling to help students plan and pursue a more challenging program of study.
8. Provide extra help.
9. Share successful practices.
10. Keep score.

According to Dr. Bottoms, the schools found that taking math (not general math) the senior year is the major indicator of success. The results of this project demonstrated that high schools are locked into low expectations for some students, have a common approach to instruction, offer different content for different students, and offer a fragmented curriculum. Dr. Bottoms argued that the State, consequently, should establish expectations for high school graduates, and then put into place an assessment system.

Ms. June Atkinson, Director - Vocational Education, DPI, explained the State's vocational education program and its implications for at-risk students. She noted that the federal Carl Perkins Act, originally enacted in 1917, defines vocational and technical education as a sequence of courses that prepare the student for employment

requiring less than a B.S. degree. It is competency-based occupational courses, which address higher order thinking skills. One-third of the students that the Carl Perkins Act reaches are the following types of special students: special education, educationally and economically deprived, those in correctional institutions, those participating in programs designed to eliminate sex bias, and those with limited English proficiency.

Federal money must be used for program improvement, not program maintenance. The Act targets limited sites and programs, and requires a State-wide core of performance measures or standards. The State provides 90% of the funds for vocational education, and receives an additional $28 million in federal funds. Beginning in 1963, the State has opted to divide these funds between community colleges (1/3) and high schools (2/3).

Mr. J.W. Eades, Associate Director - Federal Vocational Education, Department of Community Colleges, was next to discuss the vocational education programs in the community colleges. Fifty-nine percent of community college students are in two-year technical programs. He explained that Perkins II funds are distributed to colleges based on the number of Pell grants a college has and its percentage of special students. Of 58 community colleges in North Carolina, all but six qualify for a federal grant, each of which is a minimum of $50,000. In 1991-92, 38% of the funds were spent directly on the special students. Next, Dr. Henry Johnson - Assistant State Superintendent, DPI, provided a broad overview of the federal Chapter I program, which is compensatory or remedial, in the State. He stated that DPI's mission is to broaden the knowledge base of compensatory education staff to deliver quality programs. According to Dr. Johnson, DPI's priorities are: (1) program improvement and evaluation; (2) emphasize early childhood education; (3) family; (4) multicultural education; (5) school-wide programs; (6) monitoring for compliance; and (7) evaluating

the impact of end-of-course and testing program. His recommendation was to provide as much flexibility with Chapter I funds to locals as possible, such as in block grants.

After a brief lunch break, Mr. Paul Weckstein, Co-director - Center for Law and Education, was introduced to give an overview of federal categorical programs, particularly Chapter I and the 1990 Perkins Amendments. He observed that to obtain quality vocational education programs, schools should deliver a rich range of academic skills and occupational skills, the latter of which should be the base for the integration of the academic skills. He also noted that Chapter I programs, which were originally based on the assumption that remediation is connected with a hierarchy of skills, have had "very unspectacular results." He argued that Chapter I requires people in communities to sit down and discuss desired outcomes. Once the outcomes are established, students should be assessed on them, and this assessment should be used to identify strengths and weaknesses. He believes programs should be designed to build strengths, and that Chapter I programs should supplement, rather than supplant, the regular program. He commented that most schools typically use "pull-out" approaches, which really are supplanting the regular program. Finally, he stated that teachers should be involved in regular staff development, programs should be evaluated in light of desired outcomes, and improvement plans should be developed in light of evaluations.

He recommended that Chapter I programs should start with basic skills that ALL students are expected to master. Also, even though Chapter I funds go to a targeted population, they can be used to benefit all students - staff development, after school and other extended day/week programs, and school-wide projects. He observed that, within the next week, a national Commission will be suggesting improvements for the Chapter I program. One of the Commission's recommendations will be to require

states to provide all basic programs to every school before Chapter I dollars can be used. In conclusion, Mr. Weckstein made the following suggestions:

1. Require local discussions of what outcomes are desired.
2. Coordinate with regular programs and eliminate practices, such as tracking, that frustrate the purpose of Chapter 1.
3. Address resource equity issues.
4. Establish a real process for program review and evaluation.
5. Make parent involvement provisions real.
6. Investigate flexible uses of Chapter I funds - such as concentrating them in early elementary grades, or for staff development.

The final presenter of the day, Ms. Donna Smith, Chief Consultant - Compensatory Programs, DPI, discussed North Carolina initiatives with Chapter I. She stated that Chapter I programs MUST coordinate with what goes on in the regular class and that a Chapter I plan should be developed as a part of a comprehensive school improvement plan. She also observed that, currently, most units are not utilizing these funds in the most effective way. However, DPI is in the beginning stage of developing models and suggestions for local units.

The second day of this meeting opened with a presentation by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Bob Ethridge. He noted that the current system was established when our country was quite different, and has not kept up with time. He stressed that the system is very disjointed and uncoordinated, which does not serve the needs of individuals as is necessary. Originally, the system was established for core nuclear families, with mom home to look after the kids and day at work. We are seeing an increasing number of working wives and single-parent households, and the need for collaboration of human resources, the court systems, health departments, social services, and schools. He stated that North Carolina recognizes that change must be made, but it has not decided how, yet. He reported that Governor-elect Hunt supports taking existing resources and spreading them to better serve families' needs.

Superintendent Ethridge then introduced Dee Brewer, DPI, who summarized DPI's A New Covenant with Children and Families, which is based on the underlying

principle that many children, not just those in poverty, are hurting, and no single agency can solve all their problems. Its goals are that services should be comprehensive, collaborative, and integrated. She stated that inter-agency collaboration must be directed from the executive level, which should focus on the removal of barriers and provide local flexibility for service delivery. She emphasized that this plan is not a mandate, but would be voluntary for community participation. The members of the Committee responded favorably to this plan, particularly the concept that vision should be from the top, but noted that it is time for accountability based on effectiveness and that parents must be involved to ensure the plan's success.

Mr. Jim Johnson, Senior Fiscal Analyst, was introduced next. He distributed and discussed maps that illustrated the concentrations of applications for free and reduced lunches by school systems. He explained that he was in the process of breaking the applications down by school-building level.

Senator Martin presented a draft bill that would establish a family resource center grant program in the State, which would be comparable to Kentucky's program. The bill also would provide for a separate grant program which would allow local communities to develop innovative programs to address the needs of children and their families. After much discussion and debate, the Committee members made the following suggestions: (1) emphasize the need for interagency collaboration; (2) address the role of the school-based committee and the school improvement plan; and (3) increase the members of the Interagency Task Force to include a representative of the juvenile justice system and two additional parents who should be reflective of the families who will be served. Next, the Committee discussed a draft bill that would extend this study as an independent commission. Finally, the Committee directed Staff to make the necessary changes to the two drafts and to prepare a draft report for its next meeting.

## Fourth Committee Meeting -- January 4, 1993

The Committee met a final time on January 4, 1993. Mr. Jim Johnson, Senior Fiscal Analyst, distributed and explained two summaries of school buildings with at least 30% and at least 50% of their students receiving free lunch. After a discussion of the report and its two legislative proposals, the Committee voted to recommend them to the Legislative Research Commission.

## FINDINGS

### Definition of "At-Risk"

The Committee struggled with the issue of defining at-risk students. The discussion began with a narrow focus, but rapidly moved to a consensus that it is not simply students that are at risk - but most children, their families, and the communities in which they live. Evidence was presented to the Committee that the numbers of children who are potentially at-risk is escalating at an alarming rate. Early discussion within the Committee made it clear that if America is suffering decline, it is not only a problem of schools. Our social and economic system is as much to blame for not producing secure, healthy, motivated young people.

The Committee heard repeatedly that America is "at-risk", and that our region suffers considerably. "The South still lags badly behind the nation in most key child measures. Southern children are still more likely than other children to die, to be in poorer health at all ages, to become teen parents, and to lack access to adequate health resources" (Children's Defense Fund - 1989).

A variety of sources noted that, in the past, the demands of the American economy, and specifically North Carolina's economy, did not require a fully educated populace. However, rapid changes in the world marketplace have placed our nation and State in the position that in order to be competitive we must educate all of our children. Traditional ways of defining literacy and intelligence, excellence and failure, have prevented our society from tapping the rich resource of those who have traditionally been unsuccessful in school. In order to educate these students, persons and institutions charged with their educational, social and economic success must initiate different approaches that produce lasting success.

The Committee determined that many of the factors that impact upon a child's likelihood of having a successful school experience are not under the direct and primary control of the schools. Consequently, the other family, societal and economic factors must be addressed through comprehensive collaborative efforts by various governmental and non-governmental entities. This comprehensive collaborative partnership must include schools and the agencies directly concerned with social services, health, adult continuing education and employment, and community well-being. The earlier the factors are addressed through prevention and early intervention, the greater the likelihood of academic success for those children who might otherwise be unsuccessful.

The Committee determined that there is a need for a basic rethinking of how society treats its young people as a first step in solving their problems. Young children do not fail themselves, but instead, society and its institutions fail them. Such a rethinking of orientation raises the possibility that a more deliberate, useful, and comprehensive youth policy might be developed.

Testimony from a variety of sources illustrated that the State has a lack of comprehensive, meaningful data regarding children who have been placed at risk and their families. With the exception of detailed drop-out statistics and goals, there has been no comprehensive State planning focused on outcome goals for improving the condition of these children and their families. Presenters emphasized the importance of comprehensive focus and the use of outcomes information to determine whether programs are successful.

**Focus on Early Intervention**

The Committee's first priority was to focus on early education (birth - sixth grade). Consensus seemed to be that it is logical to devote attention to prevent failure early in childhood and sustain support, intensive if necessary, rather than allow students to fail - and then attempt to remediate them. Evidence showed that even expensive

prevention and early intervention programs can be more cost-effective than the enormous costs of retention, special education services, sustained remediation, and other costs particular to failure.

The Committee heard repeated testimony that a substantial number of children come to school sadly unprepared to meet the challenges ahead of them, often fail to read and learn in the early grades, and are retained repeatedly, assigned to special education, or spend year after year in counterproductive remediation programs. Statistical evidence illustrated that children who fall behind usually stay behind.

The unspoken message that seems to be communicated by these patterns of remediation programs and retention is that substantial numbers of children cannot learn as well as their classmates. However, the Committee heard evidence that refuted the proposition that school failure is inevitable for some children. The Committee agreed that virtually all children can learn, that all should be given equal meaningful access to learn at a high level, and that "underprepared schools" are as much of a problem as underprepared children.

In addition, the Committee is concerned about the apparent lack of developmentally appropriate Kindergarten instruction in North Carolina. The need for improvement of curriculum and instruction at the K-3 level that is specific to the needs of at risk children is clear.

The Committee consensus is that the term "students at risk" inappropriately labels children and often is interpreted in a manner that shifts the responsibility for being "at risk" to the student, while overlooking the underlying conditions.

**Fragmentation of Services**

Review of the wide variety of State, federal, and local programs illustrated to the Committee that the cost of long-term remediation of students who have already failed is staggering. There seems to be little coordination in the multitude of services and

programs offered these children. A large percentage of the State's investment in servicing students who are not achieving educational success seems to be dedicated to adolescents, in effect treating the symptoms rather than the illness.

The Committee concluded that many of the State's programs and services are disconnected and uncoordinated, resulting in fragmentation of services to individual families, that categorical funding seems to create many unintended barriers, and that there are alternatives that promise better coordination, which would produce a substantially improved delivery system and cost effective benefits. Consequently, the Committee believes that there is an urgent need to identify ways to use existing federal and State resources in a more efficient manner.

**Comprehensive, Integrated Solutions**

Solutions to the problems faced by the schools require more holistic approaches that fully recognize that learning begins at birth, that factors impacting on learning (such as prenatal health care and nutrition) begin even before birth, that parents and family are a child's primary teachers, that the condition of being placed at-risk is not just an educational issue, and that all concerned with childrens' welfare must act together in order to be effective. The forces and factors that impact on a child's well-being are interconnected, and must be fully addressed accordingly with comprehensive child-focused, family-based approaches.

The Committee heard five recurrent strategies that promise success in enabling students to attain academic, social, and economic success: (1) collaboration and coordination of existing human and physical resources; (2) the development of local ownership and commitment through staff and parental involvement in the planning and implementation of programs for students who have been placed at risk; (3) emphasis on prevention and early intervention; (4) opportunities for non-traditional educational experiences; and (5) focus on the family.

Numerous presenters emphasized the importance that interventions to save children growing up amid poverty, despair, and family disintegration must have a "human" face. Successful programs see the child in the context of the family, and the family in the context of its surroundings. Presenters emphasized that professionals involved in helping parents and their children must care about them, respect them, and build trust effectively. The importance of having positive role models in childrens' lives was echoed by a variety of presenters and Committee members. The decline of minority presence in the teaching profession and in educational administration is also a consensus concern of the Committee.

The Committee believes that the atmosphere for effective reform must be generated and supported from the State level, but must be implemented with a clear focus on the needs, desires and ideas of those local persons who will actually be making this process work on behalf of North Carolina children and families. "State executives and legislatures have the authority to delegate decision-making responsibility and to establish the conditions of accountability for those decisions. Both local communities and front-line service providers should have a much more prominent role in making decisions about how services are provided to meet local needs." (SREB "Readiness for School"- 1992) Since the core problems are community- and family-based, it is common sense that solutions lie at that level.

The Committee also believes that a primary State role should be the provision of incentives for local communities to develop strategic plans for the delivery of services to or on behalf of children and their families. Local ownership, commitment, and flexibility are consensus Committee principles for effective strategies.

The Committee was impressed with one model, in particular, that seems to address many of the concerns heard throughout the meetings. The Kentucky Family Resource

and Youth Services Centers Program is based on the concept of school-linked family services. Core characteristics of the Kentucky program include:

- o School-Linked collaboration and coordination of services
- o Facilitation of existing services
- o Strong client (family) orientation
- o Dedication to, and respect for, clients (families)
- o Ease of access to resources
- o Services that are coherent and easy to use
- o Grants that are targeted to high poverty level schools
- o Flexibility in the use of grants
- o Focus on support designed to empower families to be self-sufficient
- o Innovation and risk-taking
- o Crossing of traditional bureaucratic and professional boundaries
- o Resistance to "bureaucracy building"

The Committee believes this approach would also benefit the children and families of North Carolina. Furthermore, it was reported to the Committee that the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Bob Etheridge, and the Governor-elect, Jim Hunt, both support the concept of school-linked family services.

**School Programs, Organization and Practices**

Throughout the Committee's deliberations, discussion and presentations were entertained by the Committee regarding local school and State programs, organization, and practices that are directed towards children at risk of not having a successful school experience. Among topics presented and discussed were Head Start and child day-care, Chapter I programs, and vocational education.

The imminent rapid expansion of Head Start programs, recent amendments to the federal Perkins Act (vocational education), and pending Congressional reauthorization of Chapter I, all will provide opportunities for revolutionizing State and local use of federal categorical programs that have had mixed success.

In hearing about federal categorical programs dedicated to children at risk of not having a successful school experience, the Committee learned that many traditional curricular, organizational, and professional development practices of schools have been ineffective, and at times counterproductive in addressing the needs of these children and

their families. It is clear that opportunities for reform of current practices are present or emerging. It is critical that State and local units initiate innovative programs that show promise and reflect current research on effective practices for at-risk children and their families. At the same time, State and local units and schools must be prepared to discard ineffective, but well established, practices that ensure constitute barriers to success for these children.

**Extension of Study**

At the beginning of the first meeting, the Committee quickly determined that the scope and importance of the charges to the group were such that the study would need to continue through the next biennium.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. As a result of its findings, the LRC's Committee on Students at Risk recommends the following legislative proposals to the 1993-94 North Carolina General Assembly:

   a. **AN ACT TO ESTABLISH A GRANT PROGRAM TO STRENGTHEN FAMILY RESOURCES AND APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR ITS IMPLEMENTATION.** This proposal would establish: (i) a Family Resource Grant Program designed to establish centers in or near schools; (ii) an Innovation Grant Program designed to encourage family services collaboration at the county/regional level; and (iii) an Interagency Task Force on Family Resources. The proposal is intended to encourage collaboration among governmental and non-governmental agencies to develop initiatives to (i) prepare children to learn; (ii) enhance the ability of families to become advocates for the education of their families; and to (iii) enhance the ability of families to function as nurturing and effective family units. A copy of the proposed act and a summary are attached as Appendix C.

   b. **A JOINT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH THE COMMISSION TO IMPROVE EDUCATION SUPPORT SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES.** The legislation would establish an independent study commission with a revised name to continue the work of this committee through the 1993-1995 session of the North Carolina General Assembly. A copy of the proposed resolution is attached as Appendix D.

2. **The Committee also recommends that the Department of Public Instruction assist the work of the Committee through a comprehensive study of the following issues, including recommendations for reform and support:**

   a. Evaluate the effectiveness of vocational education for disadvantaged students, including a comprehensive analysis of the impact of recent amendments to the federal Perkins Act.

   b. Evaluate the effectiveness of State compensatory programs, particularly Chapter I programs. The examination of Chapter I programs should include: the extent and impact of "pull-out" programs; effective methods used to encourage parental involvement in schools; integration of Chapter I instruction into end-of-course and end-of-grade testing; use of funds for professional development of classroom teachers and certified educational support personnel; and use of Chapter I funds for promising innovative practices.

   c. Research innovative and promising curricular, instructional, and organizational practices that meet the needs of disadvantaged students including: developmentally appropriate practices for K-3; nongraded primary programs; intensive reading intervention programs; and alternative calendar arrangements that provide an academic support network for children not achieving at grade-level.

   d. Research the impact of current retention and tracking practices on the educational and social success of students.

   e. Study the potential of increasing utilization of automated information processes for gathering and analyzing data on students who are at risk of not succeeding academically. The study should include: recommendations for school-level use of information regarding targeted low-achieving populations

in conjunction with school improvement reports; the feasibility of automated individual student learning profiles; and a plan for comprehensive program evaluation based on linking student performance data regarding low achieving students to program activities.

3. **The Committee recommends that the Teacher Training Task Force, established by the 1992 Session of the General Assembly, study methods to increase the recruitment of minorities into the teaching profession.**

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

September 1, 1992

MEMORANDUM

TO: Terrence D. Sullivan, Director of Research

FROM: Daniel T. Blue, Jr., Speaker
Henson P. Barnes, President Pro Tempore
Cochairs, Legislative Research Commission

RE: Students at Risk Committee

We, as cochairs of the Legislative Research Commission (LRC) and pursuant to G.S. 120-30.17(1), hereby create the Students at Risk Committee within the Legislative Research Commission's Law Enforcement Study Grouping over which Representative Redwine is responsible. The Committee shall:

(1) Identify the educational needs of students who are at risk of failure.
(2) Study the causes which lead students to become at risk of failure and methods to alleviate the impact of those causes.
(3) Study the impact of education reform in North Carolina on students at risk of failure.
(4) Study and recommend methods to optimize coordination of federal and State efforts to address issues related to students at risk of failure.
(5) Identify educational methods that best meet the needs of at risk students and recommend how to incorporate those methods into the public education process.
(6) Study the extent of North Carolina's legal, ethical, economic, political, and civic responsibility to provide and maximize access to educational opportunity for students at risk of failure.
(7) Recommend a comprehensive plan for implementing, monitoring, and improving the delivery of educational and related services for students at risk of failure.
(8) Study the best method to evaluate services implemented to improve the delivery of educational and related services to students at risk of failure. Study of this issue shall focus on outcome measures.
(9) Study any other issues the Committee finds necessary to carry out its purpose.

We, as cochairs of the Legislative Services Commission, direct the transfer of $15,000 from the General Assembly's Reserve for Carry Forward to the LRC's Students at Risk Committee to conduct this study.

The Committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the Legislative Research Commission no later than Wednesday, January 6, 1993.

cc: Representative David Redwine
Ms. Elaine Robinson

APPENDIX B

# STUDENTS AT RISK COMMITTEE
# MEMBERSHIP - 1991 - 1992

**LRC Member:** Rep. E. David Redwine
P.O. Box 238
Shallotte, NC 28459
(919) 579-2169

**President Pro Tempore's Appointments**

Sen. William N. Martin, Cochair
P.O. Box 21325
Greensboro, NC 27420-1325
919-373-1530

Sen. J. Richard Conder
P.O. Box 1627
Rockingham, NC 28379
919-997-5551

Mr. Harold Daniel
P.O. Box 2
Apex, NC 27502

Dr. G. Thomas Houlihan
Superintendent, Johnston County Schools
P.O. Box 1336
Smithfield, NC 27577-1336

Mrs. Lorraine Moore (Replaced Dr. Tayloe)
Route 1
Ivanhoe, NC 28447

Sen. Helen R. Marvin
119 Ridge Lane
Gastonia, NC 28054
704-864-2757

Sen. Daniel R. Simpson
P.O. Drawer 1329
Morganton, NC 28655
704-437-9744

Dr. David T. Tayloe, Jr. (resigned)
2760 Medical Office Place
Goldsboro, NC 27530

**Speaker's Appointments**

Rep. Aaron E. Fussell, Cochair
1201 Briar Patch Lane
Raleigh, NC 27609
919-876-0240

Rep. W. W. Dickson
718 Avondale Road
Gastonia, NC 28054
704-864-1231

Rep. Charlotte A. Gardner
1500 W. Colonial Drive
Salisbury, NC 28144
704-636-5775

Rep. Margaret M. Jeffus
1803 Rolling Road
Greensboro, NC 27403
919-275-4762

Rep. Luther R. Jeralds
319 Jasper Street
Fayetteville, NC 28301
919-488-3542

Rep. Henry M. Michaux, Jr.
P.O. Box 2152
Durham, NC 27702
919-596-8181

Rep. Warren C. Oldham
3211 Cumberland Road
Winston-Salem, NC 27105
919-767-6936

Ms. Rhonda Raney
2808 Sourwood Street
Raleigh, NC 27610

Rep. R. Eugene Rogers
908 Woodlawn Drive
Williamston, NC 27892
919-792-4245

**Staff:**
Dr. Jim Watts
Ms. Robin Johnson
919-733-2578

**Clerk:**
Ms. Ann Jordan
919-733-5821

APPENDIX C

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA

SESSION 1993

S D

DRAFT FOR REVIEW ONLY

93-RHX-052(12.2)
(THIS IS A DRAFT AND NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION)

Short Title: Strengthening Family Resources. (Public)

Sponsors:

Referred to:

A BILL TO BE ENTITLED

AN ACT TO ESTABLISH A GRANT PROGRAM TO STRENGTHEN FAMILY RESOURCES AND APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR ITS IMPLEMENTATION.

The General Assembly of North Carolina enacts:

Section 1. A new Part is added to Article 3 of Chapter 143B of the General Statutes to read:

"Part 4B.

"Family Resources Grant Program.

"§ 143B-151. Purpose.

It is the intent of the General Assembly to encourage and support broad-based collaboration among governmental and non-governmental agencies and persons reflective of the racial and socio-economic diversity in local communities in order to develop initiatives designed to (i) prepare children to learn effectively and to have a successful school experience, (ii) enhance the ability of families to become advocates for and supporters of education for the children in their families, and (iii) enhance the ability of families to function as nurturing and effective family units.

"§ 143B-151.1 Family Resources Grant Program; creation; administration; family resource center grants; innovation grants.

(a) There is created in the Department of Human Resources a Family Resources Grant Program. The program shall be administered by the Secretary of Human Resources, upon the advice

of the Interagency Task Force on Family Resources, created in G.S. 143B-151.2.

(b) Beginning with the 1994-95 fiscal year, the program shall provide family resource center grants for individual public schools or consortia of public schools to establish family resource centers in or near the schools. A school or consortia of schools may apply for a grant if at least 25% of the students enrolled at the school or at the consortia of schools are eligible for free meals. The purpose of the family resource centers is to provide services to children from pre-kindergarten through the sixth grade and their families that are designed to enhance the children's ability to attain academic and social success.

(c) Beginning with the 1993-94 fiscal year, the program shall provide innovation grants to consortia of governmental and non-governmental agencies and other persons. The composition of the consortia shall generally reflect the racial and socio-economic diversity in their local communities. The purpose of these grants is to initiate or further develop innovative models for the effective, comprehensive, and collaborative delivery of services to children at risk of not attaining academic and social success and their families.

(d) Applications for these grants, whether for family resource centers under subsection (b) of this section or innovative models under subsection (c) of this section, shall be developed on the basis of currently available resources, and on the basis of additional resources that can be utilized to enhance the effectiveness of currently available resources.

"§ 143B-151.2. Creation of the Interagency Task Force on Family Resources.

(a) There is created the Interagency Task Force on Family Resources. The Task Force shall be located administratively within the Department of Human Resources but shall exercise its statutory powers and duties independently of the Department.

(b) The Task Force shall consist of the following 23 members and shall be generally reflective of the racial and socio-economic diversity of the State's population:

(1) Seven members to be appointed by the Governor, one of whom who shall represent each of the following:

a. The Governor's Office;

b. The Division of Social Services, Department of Human Resources;

c. The Health Division, Department of Environment, Health and Natural Resources;

d. The Employment Security Commission;
e. A parent who reflects the population of children and families eligible to receive services under this Part;
f. The juvenile justice system;
g. The Department of Community Colleges;

(2) Seven members to be appointed by the General Assembly, upon the recommendation of the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, one of whom shall represent each of the following:
a. A university department of sociology or social work;
b. A parent who reflects the population of children and families eligible to receive services under this Part;
c. Local school administrators;
d. Local public health departments;
e. Local Departments of Social Services;
f. The business community;
g. A non-governmental agency involved in the delivery of services to children and their families;

(3) Seven members to be appointed by the General Assembly, upon the recommendation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall represent each of the following:
a. A university school of education;
b. A parent who reflects the population of children and families eligible to receive services under this Part;
c. Public school teachers;
d. Local boards of education;
e. Local community mental health - developmental disabilities programs;
f. The business community;
g. A non-governmental agency involved in the delivery of services to children and their families;

(4) The Superintendent of Public Instruction or the Superintendent's designee; and

(5) The Secretary of Human Resources.

(c) Initial appointments shall be made no later than September 1, 1993. Appointments by the General Assembly shall be made in accordance with G.S. 120-121, and vacancies in those appointments

shall be filled in accordance with G.S. 120-122. The Governor shall fill any vacancies in his appointments. A member shall serve at the pleasure of the member's appointing authority.

(d) The Governor shall appoint the chair and vice-chair from the membership of the Task Force; the chair or the vice-chair shall be the Superintendent of Public Instruction or the Superintendent's designee. The chair shall call the first meeting of the Task Force.

(e) Task Force members shall receive per diem, travel and subsistence allowances in accordance with G.S. 138-5 and G.S. 138-6, as appropriate.

(f) A majority of the Task Force shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(g) All clerical and other services required by the Task Force shall be supplied by the Secretary of Human Resources.

"**§ 143B-151.3. Powers and duties of the Task Force; powers and duties of agencies represented on Task Force.**

(a) For purposes of developing and supporting initiatives under this Part, the Interagency Task Force on Family Resources shall:

(1) Advise the Secretary of Human Resources on the development of a family resource center grant application package and an innovation grant application package.

(2) Develop guidelines for the competitive awarding of grants and advise the Secretary of Human Resources on scoring procedures for grant applications. The guidelines for the awarding of family resource center grants under G.S. 143B-151.1(b) shall be based primarily on the need of a school, consortia of schools, or local community, along with the likelihood of success and the achievement of positive outcomes. Awarding of innovation grants shall not necessarily be subject to the requirements contained in G.S. 143B-151.1(b) with regard to eligibility for free lunch; however, all innovation grants shall be targeted to meet the needs of children and families projected to be at risk. The guidelines for the awarding of innovation grants under G.S. 143B-151.1(c) may be based on the need of a local community, but primarily shall be based on the likelihood of the proposed model's success, the creative design of the proposed model, and the potential for

subsequent replication of the model in other communities.

(3) Develop a process for, and the content of, training and education for personnel who will be assisting in the preparation of grants.

(4) Review scored grant applications and make recommendations on grant recipients to the Secretary of Human Resources.

(5) Develop recommendations with regard to statutes, policies, and rules so as to improve the effectiveness and timeliness of service delivery through individual agencies and through collaboration among agencies.

(6) Collect, analyze, evaluate, and disseminate information on initiatives within and outside North Carolina that are successful or promising in addressing issues that constitute the focus of this Part.

(7) Report at least annually to the Governor, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairs of the appropriations committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the chairs of the Legislative Research Commission's Committee on Students at Risk or any successor legislative study committees.

(b) For purposes of developing and supporting family resource centers under this Part, the Interagency Task Force on Family Resources shall:

(1) Formulate before January 1, 1994, a five-year plan for implementing a network of family resource centers across the State. The plan shall promote identification and coordination of existing resources. The plan shall include strategies for implementing the activities for which grant applicants are required to provide a work plan in accordance with G.S. 143B-151.4(1)k.

(2) Develop a process for, and the content of, training and education for personnel who will be operating the family resource centers, or assisting grant recipients in operating the centers.

(3) Develop model procedures that family resource centers can follow for sharing confidential information with other service providers.

(4) Evaluate the effectiveness of the family resource centers' activities.

(5) Compile and analyze data and other information needed to implement the family resource grant program and to operate the centers, and identify additional data and information that are needed.

(6) Work with the Legislative Research Commission's Committee on Students at Risk or any successor legislative study committees in developing a timetable and plan for fully implementing a statewide plan predicated on the philosophy of the family resource centers.

(7) Formulate a plan for serving the needs of children in grades 7 and above and their families, after the family resource center grant program is substantially developed.

(8) Formulate a plan, with a timetable for beginning implementation no later than January 1, 2000, for expanding family resource centers to all schools within the State where justifiable need is evident, regardless of whether 25% of the students at that school are eligible for free meals.

(c) For the purpose of developing innovative initiatives for the effective, comprehensive, and collaborative delivery of services to children and their families, agencies represented on the Task Force that have corresponding agencies at the county level shall:

(1) Determine the counties in which there are personnel who are committed to the philosophy underlying G.S. 143B-151.

(2) Engage county-level personnel in developing the most effective comprehensive, collaborative models possible for the delivery of services to children and their families that will better enable children to achieve academic and social success.

(3) Develop a plan to establish goals and anticipated outcomes for initiatives, and a system to measure their success.

(4) Establish professional development opportunities for personnel within the agencies that are based on new information that results from the initiatives.

(d) In carrying out its responsibilities under this section, the Task Force may enter into any consultative and contractual arrangements as are necessary.

"§ 143B-151.4. Powers and duties of the Secretary of Human Resources.

The Secretary shall:

(1) Develop, upon the advice of the Interagency Task Force on Family Resources, a family resource center grant application package and provide it to each local school administrative unit in which there are qualifying schools. The package shall include grant proposal instructions and grant scoring procedures. Grant applications may be submitted by the local school administrative unit or by a consortia of agencies. The following information shall be provided as a part of each grant application:

a. A statement of the school's or consortium's need for a family resource center.

b. Proposed goals and anticipated outcomes for a center.

c. A list of all services that will be provided at the center and a description of how they will be provided.

d. A plan for serving children and their families with the most urgent needs first.

e. Documentation of the approval of each school's building-level committee convened under G.S. 115C-238.3(b1), and a copy of each school's building-level plan, which shall reflect the need for the center and the proposed goals and anticipated outcomes for the center.

f. Evidence of agreement and support from all other service providers.

g. A description of the development, composition, and role of a local advisory council. This council shall generally reflect the racial and socio-economic diversity of the community's population, and shall generally reflect, but shall not be limited to, the composition of the Interagency Task Force.

h. Strategies to disseminate information.

i. A training plan.

j. A plan to minimize stigma.

k. A work plan for identifying and coordinating existing resources so as to implement (i) full-time preschool child care for children

two and three years old, (ii) after school child care when school is in session and full-time when it is not for children four through twelve years old, (iii) an integrated approach to home visits, group meetings, and the monitoring of child development for new and expectant parents, (iv) training in developmentally appropriate parenting skills for parents, (v) support and training for child day care providers, (vi) health services, referral to health services, or both, and (vii) other services designed to satisfy unique community needs.

l. Job descriptions for staff.

m. Plans to contract for the services of consultants or other professionals to provide services or operate the center.

n. A description of the center's location and its accessibility to the school and to the children and families to be served.

o. The hours of operation of the center.

p. A proposed budget that includes the use of grant funds and funds from other sources.

q. A program evaluation plan.

r. Letters of endorsement and commitment to the center from community agencies and organizations.

(2) Develop, upon the advice of the Interagency Task Force on Family Resources, an innovation grant application package and provide it to each county. The package shall include grant proposal instructions, grant scoring procedures, and a grant application form that requires the following information:

a. A statement of the need for the innovation grant.

b. A list of all services that will be provided and a description of how and where they will be provided.

c. Proposed goals and outcomes for the innovative system.

d. Evidence of agreement and support from all service providers.

e. Documentation of broad-based collaboration among governmental agencies, non-governmental agencies, and other persons.

f. A plan for serving children and their families with the most urgent needs first.

g. A description of the development, composition, and role of a local advisory council. This council shall generally reflect the racial and socio-economic diversity of the community's population, and shall generally reflect, but shall not be limited to, the composition of the Interagency Task Force.

h. Strategies to disseminate information as to the availability of grants.

i. A proposed budget that includes the use of grant funds and funds from other sources.

j. A program evaluation plan.

k. A plan to obtain additional funds and resources from non-governmental sources.

l. Any additional information the Secretary considers necessary.

(3) Designate and train a person in each county to assist in the preparation of grant applications.

(4) Adopt, upon the advice of the Task Force, scoring procedures for the grant applications.

(5) Select and train reviewers to score the grant applications.

(6) Submit the scored grant applications to the Task Force for its recommendations.

(7) Select grant recipients, after consideration of the recommendations of the Task Force.

(8) Provide technical assistance to the family resource centers.

(9) Evaluate the activities of the family resource centers.

(10) Provide assistance to grant recipients to enable them to pursue additional sources of funding and other resources.

"§ 143B-151.5. Plans for effective utilization of fiscal resources.

(a) Each governmental agency that is represented on the Interagency Task Force on Family Resources shall develop a plan for effective utilization of all fiscal resources, including

federal funds, and other resources under the agency's control in a manner that best supports the goals of this Part.

(b) Each governmental agency that is represented on the Task Force is encouraged to establish any commissions the agency considers necessary to develop the plans required under subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Each governmental agency that is represented on the Task Force shall present its plan and report on the progress in developing and implementing its plan at least biannually to the Task Force."

Sec. 2. G.S. 115C-21(a) reads as rewritten:

"§ 115C-21. Powers and duties generally.

(a) Administrative Duties. -- It shall be the duty of the Superintendent of Public Instruction:

(1) To organize and establish a Department of Public Instruction which shall include such divisions and departments as are necessary for supervision and administration of the public school system, to administer the funds for the operation of the Department of Public Instruction, and to enter into contracts for the operations of the Department of Public Instruction.

(2) To keep the public informed as to the problems and needs of the public schools by constant contact with all school administrators and teachers, by his personal appearance at public gatherings, and by information furnished to the press of the State.

(3) To report biennially to the Governor 30 days prior to each regular session of the General Assembly, such report to include information and statistics of the public schools, with recommendations for their improvement and for such changes in the school law as shall occur to him.

(4) To have printed and distributed such educational bulletins as he shall deem necessary for the professional improvement of teachers and for the cultivation of public sentiment for public education, and to have printed all forms necessary and proper for the administration of the Department of Public Instruction.

(5) To have under his direction, in his capacity as the constitutional head of the public school system, all those matters relating to the supervision and administration of the public school system.

(5a) To institute and maintain a plan to ensure that schools are ready to receive children and their families in an environment that is inviting and supportive and that encourages the families' participation.

(6) To create a special fund within the Department of Public Instruction to manage funds received as grants from nongovernmental sources in support of public education. The Superintendent may accept grants and gifts from corporations and other sources made in support of public education and may hold and disburse such funds, in accordance with the purposes, conditions, and limitations associated with such grants and gifts. Any special fund created pursuant to this subdivision shall be subject to audit by the State Auditor.

(7) To have solely under his direction and control all matters relating to provision of staff services and support to the State Board of Education, including implementation of federal programs on behalf of the State Board of Education, except as otherwise provided in the Current Operations Appropriations Act."

Sec. 3. The Frank Porter Graham Center at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill shall conduct a short-term program evaluation and shall develop a system to measure and analyze the long-term goals and outcomes of the Family Resources Grant Program established in Section 1 of this act, and shall file a written report no later than February 15, 1995 with the chair of the Interagency Task on Family Resources, the Governor, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairs of the appropriations committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the chairs of the Legislative Research Commission's Committee on Students at Risk or any successor legislative study committees.

Sec. 4. There is appropriated from the General Fund to the Department of Human Resources the sum of nine hundred fifty thousand dollars ($950,000) for the 1993-94 fiscal year and the sum of eight million four hundred fifty thousand dollars ($8,450,000) for the 1994-95 fiscal year to implement the provisions of this act.

Of these funds:

(1) The sum of two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000) shall be used each year of the biennium by the Department of Human Resources, Office of the Secretary, for training, materials, and consultation services.

(2) The sum of seven million five hundred thousand dollars ($7,500,000) shall be used in the 1994-95 fiscal year for grants of up to seventy-five thousand dollars ($75,000) per individual public school or consortia of public schools to begin implementation of the family resource center grants established in G.S. 143B-151(b) in order to establish family resource centers in at least 50 counties. These grants shall be based on the guidelines established under G.S. 143B-151.3(a)(2).

(3) The sum of seven hundred fifty thousand dollars ($750,000) shall be used each year of the biennium for grants of up to thirty thousand dollars ($30,000) per consortia to begin implementation of the innovation grants established in G.S. 143B-151.1(c). These grants shall be based on the guidelines established under G.S. 143B-151.3(a)(2).

Sec. 5. This act becomes effective July 1, 1993.

**North Carolina General Assembly**
Legislative Services Office
Legislative Office Building
300 N. Salisbury Street, Raleigh, N. C. 27603-5925

GEORGE R. HALL, JR., Legislative Administrative Officer
(919) 733-7044

M. GLENN NEWKIRK, Director
Automated Systems Division
Suite 400, (919) 733-6834

GERRY F. COHEN, Director
Bill Drafting Division
Suite 100, (919) 733-6660

THOMAS L. COVINGTON, Director
Fiscal Research Division
Suite 619, (919) 733-4910

TERRENCE D. SULLIVAN, Director
Research Division
Suite 545, (919) 733-2578

December 21, 1992

MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Members of the LRC's Committee on Students At Risk

**FROM:** Robin S. Johnson, Committee Counsel
Dr. Jim Watts, Education Specialist

**RE:** **Proposed Strengthening Family Resources Legislation (Draft 93-RH-051)**

**Section 1** of the proposed bill would add a new **Part4B to Article 3 of Chapter 143B**, establishing the Family Resources Grant Program and providing for two types of grants: family resource center grants and innovation grants. The bill includes a framework for the administration of the program and grant eligibility.

**Section 143B-151** provides that the intent of the program is to encourage and support broad-based collaboration in order to develop initiatives designed to prepare children to learn effectively, to enhance families' roles as advocates for their children's education, and to enhance the ability of families to nurture and function as effective family units.

**Section 143B-151.1(a)** would create the Family Resources Grant Program in the Human Resource Department, administered by the Secretary of Human Resources with the advice of an Interagency Task Force. **Subsection (b)** would establish family resource center grants for individual schools or consortia of public schools beginning in the 1994-95 fiscal year. To be eligible for these grants, each school must have at least 25% of its population eligible for free lunch. The purpose of the family resource centers is to provide services to pre-K through sixth grade children and their families that would enhance the children's ability to attain academic and social success. **Subsection (c)** would establish innovation grants for consortia of agencies and other persons beginning in the 1993-94 fiscal year. The purpose of these grants is to initiate or further develop innovative models for effective, comprehensive, and collaborative service delivery to children who are at risk of not attaining academic and social success. **Subsection (d)** provides that applications for either grant must be based on currently existing resources and additional resources that can be used to enhance existing resources.

**Section 143B-151.2** would create a new Interagency Task Force on Family Resources in the Department of Human Resources. The Task Force will be composed of 22 members, including six appointed by the Governor, seven appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, seven appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Superintendent of Public Instruction or his designee, and the Secretary of Human Resources. The appointees would include parents and representatives of a variety of interested public agencies, schools, and universities, and non-governmental agencies that serve children. The Governor would appoint the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Task Force, one of whom must be the Superintendent of Public Instruction or the Superintendent's designee.

**Section 143B-151.3(a)** would direct the Task Force to (1) advise the Secretary of Human Resources on the development of grant application packages, (2) develop guidelines for competitive awarding of grants, (3) develop a process for training personnel who will assist in preparing grants, (4) review scored applications and make recommendations to the Secretary, (5) develop recommendations concerning laws and rules in order to improve service delivery, and (6) make annual reports to the appointing authorities and others.

**Subsection (b)** would require the Task Force to (1) formulate a five year plan to implement family resource centers, (2) develop training for personnel who will operate family resource centers, (3) develop model procedures for family resource centers concerning the sharing of confidential information, (4) evaluate family resource centers, (5) compile and analyze information needed to implement family resource centers, (6) develop a State-wide plan for fully implementing family resource centers, (7) formulate a plan for serving the needs of children in grades 7 and above after the family resource center program is substantially implemented, and (8) formulate a timetable to expand family resource centers to all schools within the State where justifiable need is evident by January 1, 2000.

In order to develop innovative initiatives for effective, comprehensive, and collaborative delivery of services to children and their families, **subsection (c)** would direct agencies represented on the Task Force to (1) engage county level personnel in developing comprehensive collaborative models, (2) develop plans for setting goals and outcomes, and systems to measure their success, and (3) establish internal professional development opportunities based on what is learned from the new initiatives.

**Section 143B-151.4** would direct the Secretary of Human Resources, among other things, to develop grant packages with specific requirements for each type of grant. The section also outlines grant application assistance and scoring procedures, and requires technical assistance and evaluation for the resource centers.

**Section 143B-141.5** would direct each governmental agency that is represented on the Task Force to develop a plan for the effective utilization of all fiscal resources under the agency's control. This section also would direct these agencies to report their progress to the Task Force.

**Section 2 of the proposed bill** would direct the Superintendent of Public Instruction to institute and maintain a plan to ensure that schools are ready to receive children and their families in a supporting environment that encourages the families' participation.

**Section 3 of the proposed bill** would direct the Frank Porter Graham Center at UNC to conduct a short-term program evaluation, to develop a system to evaluate long-term gains, and to report to the appointing authorities and others by February 15, 1995.

**Section 4 of the proposed bill** would provide appropriations to the Department of Human Resources of $950,000 for fiscal year 1993-94 and of $8,450,000 for fiscal year 1994-95 for implementation of the act.

**Section 5 of the proposed bill** would provide that the act becomes effective July 1, 1993.

DRAFT FOR REVIEW ONLY

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA

SESSION 1993

S D

SENATE/HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 93-RHX-018 (12.3.92)
THIS IS A DRAFT 15-DEC-92 08:41:28

Sponsors:

Referred to:

A JOINT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH THE COMMISSION TO IMPROVE EDUCATION SUPPORT SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.

Whereas, in 1992 the Legislative Research Commission authorized the study of issues related to students at risk of not attaining academic, social, and economic success in order to (i) identify how the delivery of educational services from preschool through twelfth grade fails to address these students' needs, (ii) develop proposals to improve the delivery of educational services to these students, and (iii) recommend the human and economic services necessary to improve these students' individual optimal potentials; and

Whereas, the Students at Risk Study Committee was unable to complete its work due to its broad scope; and

Whereas, the Students at Risk Study Committee has identified further issues affecting these students that need to be studied in order to carry out its purpose:

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives (OR by the House of Representatives, the Senate) concurring:

Section 1. There is established the Commission to Improve Education Support Services to Children and Families to continue the work of the Study Committee on Students at Risk established in 1992 by the Legislative Research Commission, as structured by Article 6B of Chapter 120 of the General Statutes. The study shall:

(1) Identify the needs of students who are at risk of not attaining academic, social, and economic success.

(2) Study the causes that lead students to become at risk of not attaining academic, social, and

economic success and methods to alleviate the impact of those causes.

(3) Study the impact of education reform in North Carolina on students at risk of not attaining academic, social, and economic success.

(4) Study and recommend methods to optimize coordination between federal and State efforts to address issues related to students at risk of not attaining academic, social, and economic success.

(5) Identify educational methods that best meet the needs of at risk students and recommend how to incorporate these methods into the public education process.

(6) Study the extent of North Carolina's legal, ethical, economic, political, and civic responsibility to provide and maximize access to educational opportunity for students at risk of not attaining academic, social, and economic success.

(7) Recommend a comprehensive plan to implement, monitor, and improve the delivery of educational and related services for students at risk of not attaining academic, social, and economic success.

(8) Determine the best method for evaluating delivery services designed to improve the delivery of educational and related services to students at risk of not attaining academic, social, and economic success. Study of this issue shall focus on outcome measures.

(9) Monitor and evaluate the implementation plan for Family Resource Centers developed by the Interagency Task Force on Family Resource Centers, if established, and recommend improvements to enable this Task Force to carry out its purpose.

(10) Identify existing resources, including, but not limited to, funds and services currently available for dropout prevention, teen pregnancy, and alcohol and drug abuse prevention, targeted for students in grades seven through 12, and recommend methods to coordinate these resources more effectively and efficiently.

(11) Study the fragmented service delivery systems in areas such as education, health, mental health, and social services at both the State and local levels, identify barriers to interagency collaboration, and

recommend a plan that would enable agencies to collaborate more effectively on the delivery of needed services to students at risk and their families.

(12) Study any other issues necessary to carry out the purpose of the study.

Sec. 2. The Commission shall consist of 16 members appointed as follows:

(1) The President Pro Tempore of the Senate shall appoint eight members, at least five of whom are members of the Senate. The President Pro Tempore shall designate one cochair of the Commission.

(2) The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint eight members, at least five of whom are members of the House of Representatives. The Speaker shall designate one cochair of the Commission.

The members shall be appointed no later than September 1, 1993. If a vacancy occurs in the membership, the appointing authority shall appoint another member to serve for the balance of the unexpired term.

Sec. 3. The Commission may submit an interim report of its findings and recommendations to the General Assembly no later than May 15, 1994 by filing the report with the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Commission shall submit a final report of its findings and recommendation to the General Assembly no later than January 15, 1995 by filing the report with the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Upon filing its final report, the Commission shall terminate.

Sec. 4. The Commission, while in the discharge of official duties, may exercise all the powers provided under G.S. 120-19, and G.S. 120-19.1 through G.S. 120-19.4. The Commission may meet at any time upon the joint call of the cochairs. The Commission may, with the prior approval of the Legislative Services Commission, meet in the Legislative Building or the Legislative Office Building.

Sec. 5. Members of the Commission shall receive subsistence and travel expenses in accordance with G.S. 138-5, 138-6, or 120-3.1, as appropriate.

Sec. 6. The Commission may contract for professional, clerical, or consultant services as provided by G.S. 120-32.02. The Legislative Services Commission, through the Legislative

Administrative Officer, shall assign professional staff to assist in the work of the Commission. The House of Representatives' and the Senate's Supervisors of Clerks shall assign clerical staff to the Commission, upon the direction of the Legislative Services Commission. The expenses relating to clerical employees shall be borne by the Commission.

Sec. 7. There is appropriated from the General Fund to the General Assembly the sum of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for the 1993-94 fiscal year and the sum of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for the 1994-95 fiscal year to fund the Commission to Improve Education Support Services to Children and Families.

Sec. 8. This resolution becomes effective July 1, 1993.